

Appl. No. 10/643,249  
Docket No. 2102397-992780  
Response to Office Action of November 28, 2005

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 18 2006

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This amendment is submitted with a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1-10 have been rejected. Claims 1-10 have been canceled. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The acceptance of the drawings is noted with appreciation.

Newly added claims 11-20 are allowable for at least the following reasons:

First with respect to independent claims 11 and 18, the prior art does not show a multiplexer which receives a plurality of protocol signals, and a select signal and in response thereto outputs one of the plurality of protocol signals. Further, the memory device of claim 1 has a user selectable non-volatile memory for storing user input representative of the one protocol and for generating the select signal. In contrast, USP 6,851,014 ("Chang") cited in the last office action, discloses a protocol detection circuit which "monitors signals provided to operation interface...to determine whether the host controller... employs the FWH communication protocol or the LPC communication protocol." (col. 5, lines 44-48; see also 5: 51-54; and 8:39-43). Thus, unlike the present invention, Chang discloses a protocol detection circuit that detects the protocol supplied "on the fly" from the communication bus. In contrast in the present invention, the desired one protocol is stored in a user selectable non-volatile memory, and once the input representative of the one protocol is stored, the memory device is responsive to communication signal only in the one protocol. Structurally, this is also different because in the present invention, this is accomplished by the use of a multiplexer to select the one protocol from the plurality of protocols supplied based upon the select signal. Thus, independent claims 11 and 18 are patentable for at least this reason.

As for independent claim 20, whose embodiment is shown in Figure 7, it is respectfully submitted that there is nothing in Chang that discloses the use of a delay circuit as claimed in claim 20.

Appl. No. 10/643,249  
Docket No. 2102397-992780  
Response to Office Action of November 28, 2005

It is submitted that claims 11-20 are allowable, and allowance and issuance of this application is respectfully requested.


For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in an allowable form, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 07-1896, **referencing docket number 2102397-992780.**

Respectfully submitted,

**DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY USA LLP**

Date: July 18, 2006

By:   
Ronald L. Yin  
Reg. No. 27,607

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Ronald L. Yin  
DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary USA LLP  
2000 University Avenue  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2248  
650-833-2437 (Direct)  
650-833-2000 (Main)  
650-833-2001 (Facsimile)  
ronald.yin@dlapiper.com